2003-2004 Report on the Preliminary Needs Survey of Foreign Language Education at Kyushu University (English)

INOUE, Narahiko
Faculty of Languages and Cultures, Kyushu University

2003-2004 Report on the Preliminary Needs Survey of Foreign Language Education at Kyushu University (English)

INOUE Narahiko

Below is a reproduction (with some modifications) of "Report on the Preliminary Needs Survey of Foreign Language Education at Kyushu University" circulated in the faculty project group in Japanese (2003) and in English (2004). I have decided to make it public so that it can give some historical background to the development of the English curriculum in Kyushu University. I also hope this and other results of the project, to be released later, will be important resources for critical needs analysis about English education of universities in Japan, and of other institutions around the world (Foreign Language Needs Analysis Group, 2010).

Inspired by the emerging critical works in ESL/EFL literature in the 1990s (e.g., Benesch, 1993; Canagarajah, 1993; Pennycook, 1994; Crookes & Lehner, 1998), our group proposed a critical needs analysis in foreign languages, which was awarded a KAKEN Grant-in-Aid for Exploratory Research (No. 15652035). Our intent was to reveal power relations involved in curriculum decisions in the university faculty power hierarchy among other things, hopefully to fight back. At the same time, I had a further agenda to reveal a problem of "English studies" hegemony in English language education in Japan (cf. Inoue, 2005). The project and related works in the Faculty led to a new English curriculum heavily focused on "Academic English" especially reading/writing and presentation, which later led to the first version of Q-LEAP (Kyushu University - Learning English for Academic Purposes) (Q-LEAP, 2013, 2015; Tsuda, 2005; Inoue, 2005; Yasuda, 2015). Its most recent version is described in another article in this volume (Haswell et al., 2022). In retrospect, many of the problems

have been identified and discussed but not many have been fixed. Of course such judgmental views in this introduction as well as those in the the original report below are of my own and may not be shared by other project members.

References

Benesch, S. (1993). ESL, ideology, and the politics of pragmatism. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(4), 705-717. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587403

Canagarajah, A. S. (1993). Critical ethnography of a Sri Lankan classroom: Ambiguities in student opposition to reproduction through ESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(4), 601-626. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587398

Crookes, G., & Lehner, A. (1998). Aspects of process in an ESL critical pedagogy teacher education course. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(2), 319-351. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587398

Foreign Language Needs Analysis Group. (2010). *Foreign Language Needs Analysis at University: A Research Report.* Kyushu University, Faculty of Languages and Cultures. http://hdl.handle.net/2324/4771853

Haswell, C., O'Dwyer, S., Otsu, T., Otsuka, T., & Tsuchiya, T. (2022). Kyushudaigaku gakujutsu eigo shin karikyuramu Q-LEAP 3 [Kyushu University academic English new curriculum Q-LEAP 3]. *Studies in English Language and Literature,* 72, 1-22.

Inoue, N. (2005). What's Going on inside the pine tower of Babel?: Foreign language curriculum reform in a Japanese university. In Inoue (ed.), *Teaching English in Japanese Universities in a Global Age: Current Problems and Future Prospects* (pp. 87-115). Faculty of Languages and Cultures, Kyushu University. http://hdl.handle.net/2324/4771875

Pennycook, A. (1994). Critical pedagogical approaches to research. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(4), 690–693. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587555

Q-LEAP (Kyushu University - Learning English for Academic Purposes). (2013). Draft of Q-LEAP (2013.12.27). Retrieved February 25, 2022 from http://www.flc.kyushu-u.ac.jp/upfiles/100_1390035881_0.pdf

Q-LEAP (Kyushu University - Learning English for Academic Purposes). (2015). Retrieved February 25, 2022 from http://flc.kyushu-u.ac.jp/qleap.pdf

Tsuda, A. (2005). Daigaku eigo kyoiku no puroguramu bunseki [A program analysis of university English education]. In Inoue (ed.), *Teaching English in Japanese Universities in a Global Age: Current Problems and Future Prospects* (pp. 1-86). Faculty of Languages and Cultures, Kyushu University. https://doi.org/10.15017/1654392

Yasuda, S. (2015). An overview of the university English curriculum: A conceptual framework for curriculum innovation. *Bulletin of KIKAN Education, 1,* 102-117. https://doi.org/10.15017/1495426

A Report on the Preliminary Needs Survey of Foreign Language Education at Kyushu University (English)

1. Introduction

In 2001, we started a joint project in the Studies of Language Education, Faculty of Languages and Cultures (FLC), Kyushu University. The project is concerned with a critical needs analysis of foreign language education in Kyushu University. This document is to report the tentative results and my own analyses of the section concerning English education in a preliminary survey for the project. I will also give a few notes for the main survey targeting all the faculty members in Kyushu University.

This report was originally prepared in Japanese as an internal document for discussion among the project members but later it was slightly revised for limited circulation. The analyses presented here are Inoue's tentative views and are not necessarily shared by the project group.

This report is concerned with quantitative survey questions and not with responses to open-ended questions.

2. Data Collection

This preliminary survey was conducted for three groups of people participating in foreign language education at Kyushu University: (1) content-area instructors, (2) students (Engineering freshmen), and (3) English instructors. They received survey questions with essentially the same contents. Appendix will show the English version for English instructors.

2.1. Data Collection from Content-Area Instructors

For the survey of content-area instructors, the questionnaire under the FLC Dean's name was sent to a professor in charge of academic affairs of each undergraduate school. It was sent via campus mail in July-August, 2002. Table 1 gives the number of respondents in each Faculty, to which professors belong (Faculties and Undergraduate/Graduate Schools do not necessarily correspond although they often overlap). Table 2 shows the return rate in each undergraduate School that the professors are responsible for. Table 3 shows the ages and genders of the

respondents. As Table 2 shows, the collected data were skewed toward science and technology fields and did not correctly reflect the whole body of professors in Kyushu University. One thing to note here is that these skewed returns may reflect the higher level of expectation in English education among science professors (who have not given up the FLC for language teaching) than among humanities/social sciences professors (who are suspicious about or have given up the FLC).

Table 1. The Number of Respondents in Each Faculty

FACULTY	NUMBER
Humanities	0
Social & Cultural Studies	0
Human Environment Studies (Architecture)	1
Law	2
Economics	3
Languages & Cultures	0
Sciences	4
Mathematics	7
Medical Sciences	6
Pharmaceutical Sciences	6
Dental Sciences	0
Engineering	11
Information Science and Electrical Engineering	3
Engineering Sciences	0
Agriculture	12
TOTAL	55

Table 2. Return Rate in Each Undergraduate School

SCHOOLS	DISTRIBUTED	RETURNED	RATE (%)
Letters	5	0	0
Education	5	0	0
Law	6	2	33.3
Economics	6	3	50.0
Sciences	6	11	183.3
Medicine	10	6	60.0
Dentistry	2	0	0
Pharmaceutical Sciences	10	6	60.0
Engineering	22	15	68.2
Agriculture	16	12	75.0
TOTAL	88	55	62.5*

*56.8%, if the rate in Sciences is corrected as 100%.

Table 3. Age and Gender Distributions in Content-Area Respondents

AGES	NUMBERS	GENDER	NUMBER
30s	8	Male	54
40s	22	Female	1
50s	18		
60s	7		

2.2. Data Collection from Engineering Freshmen

The questionnaire was revised so that its questions could be answered by students. The pilot survey was conducted in one of the classes that Inoue was teaching in October 2002. The questionnaire was distributed in a class of one of the required courses for freshmen ("British & American Language & Culture I"). The responses were collected in the next week's class but several students turned them in later. The return rate is shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Return Rate of Engineering Undergraduates

School	Distributed	Returned	Rate %
School of Engineering	76	60	78.9

The students' data came only from engineering freshmen and thus were skewed. But the content-area faculty data were also skewed toward science majors, which enables some comparison. Another problem is that freshmen do not have specific images of their future use of English. This made the students choose fewer items from the list of language use situations and their perception lacks strong grounds. For the curriculum development, we must consider how we should motivate these freshmen (and sophomores) who do not have enough knowledge about their future needs of foreign languages, if we continue to concentrate language courses in the first two years. (Cf. This problem has also been pointed out by other surveys and faculty-development meetings in the university.)

2.3. Data Collection from English Instructors

The questionnaire was slightly modified to collect data from instructors of English in the general education program. The Japanese version was first

INOUE Narahiko

prepared. It was translated into English by Inoue, which was modified based on the suggestions from Professor Quinn and Professor Anscomb-Iino. I tried to maintain the functional equivalence of questions and response items but a method of back translation was not used. The questionnaires were distributed in February 2003. They were distributed in the instructors' mailboxes and collected in drop-off boxes. The breakdown of the respondents and return rates are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Respondents from English Instructors

Instructor Status	Distributed	Returned	Rate%
Full-Time Japanese	17	5	29.4
Full-Time Foreigner	5	4	80.0
Part-Time Japanese	30	1	3.3
Part-Time Foreigner	22	10	45.5
TOTAL	74	20	27.0

Non-Japanese instructors ("Foreigner" above) both full-time and part-time are all so-called native speakers of English (North American and British). Return rates from English instructors varied greatly; especially Japanese instructors' returns were very low. Even among the full-time instructors, the rate is about 30%. Since this figure includes members in the project, Japanese instructors outside the needs analysis project group virtually ignored the questionnaire. This can be interpreted as their lack of attitude to analyze English education and to systematically cope with the improvement of English education and curriculum development.

3. Results and Discussion

This preliminary questionnaire has problems in the way the questions were asked and thus is not subject to rigorous statistical analysis, which had not been intended because of the exploratory nature of the survey. The problems include: (1) Choosing items with rank orders was too complex; (2) Giving rank orders was optional; and (3) The number of chosen items in a given question varied from respondent to respondent. Nonetheless, responses were tabulated without giving weights depending of the number of selected items from different

respondents. The tables below will give frequency distributions, percentiles based on the number of respondents, resulting ranks in each category.

Question 1. Instructors' Uses of English

Table 6 shows the uses of English among instructors. The student version did not have this question.

Table 6. Professors' Uses of English

Q1. Instructors' Uses of English	Content-Area N=55			English Instructors N=20		
	#	%	Rank	#	%	Rank
1-0 Do you use English in your own research? (1 Yes)	55	100		20	100	
1-1 I read printed and Web pages with technical contents.	50	90.9	2	17	85.0	1
1-2 I read printed and Web pages with non-technical contents.	21	38.2	13	17	85.0	1
1-3 I read email with technical contents.	38	69.1	7	11	55.0	9
1-4 I read email with non-technical contents.	22	40.0	12	15	75.0	6
1-5 I write research papers with technical contents.	51	92.7	1	16	80.0	4
1-6 I write memos and reports with technical contents.	33	60.0	9	8	40.0	15
1-7 I write memos and reports with non-technical contents.	11	20.0	15	11	55.0	9
1-8 I write email with technical contents.	38	69.1	7	12	60.0	8
1-9 I write email with non-technical contents.	25	45.5	11	16	80.0	4
1-10 I listen to presentations and lectures with technical contents.	47	85.5	3	17	85.0	1
1-11 I listen to presentations and lectures with non-technical contents.	14	25.5	14	9	45.0	13
1-12 I give presentations and lectures with technical contents.	46	83.6	4	10	50.0	12
1-13 I give presentations and lectures with non-technical contents.	7	12.7	17	9	45.0	13
1-14 I engage in conversations with technical contents.	41	74.5	5	11	55.0	9
1-15 I engage in conversations with non-technical contents.	31	56.4	10	14	70.0	7
1-16 I participate in discussion and debate with technical contents.	39	70.9	6	8	40.0	15
1-17 I participate in discussion and debate with non-technical contents.	10	18.2	16	7	35.0	17
1-90 a. Other ( )	3	5.5		2	10.0	

When we look at top-ranked items, content-area instructors are using English mainly in the domain of their specialized fields whereas English instructors are reading generic contents and writing emails about generic contents. One

reservation is that English instructors include so-called native speakers of English, whose pattern of English use probably contributed to this result.

Among the technical contents, content-area instructors' most frequent choice was writing research papers, and also ranked high were production-oriented activities such as oral presentations and conversations. English instructors, on the other hand, ranked writing papers as the 4th and other production activities like oral presentations were ranked low with around 50% of the respondents. This may be variously interpreted and needs further analysis. English instructors might be less active in academic activities. Japanese instructors of English are likely to publish their work in Japanese.

Question 2. Uses of English in Content-Area Courses

The content-area instructors were asked about their uses of English in content-area courses. The students and English instructors were asked about their perception (prediction) about such uses. The responses are shown in Table 7. Items related to reading activities were predictably ranked high. A notable gap of perception is that only about 30% of the content-area instructors chose translation from English to Japanese while English instructors' perception indicated 90%. Another gap is that only about 30% of the content-area instructors give writing tasks to students such as report writing; the actual uses in this domain is less than the perception of students and English instructors. However, when we look at the ranking, English instructors ranked writing low while writing was ranked high among the uses in content-area courses. Other production activities such as oral presentations were chosen by only the half of the content-area instructors who chose writing. In light of the students' ability, which makes oral presentation a heavy burden for students, it is remarkable that more than 10% of the instructors (7 out of 55) reported that they used oral presentation in class.

Table 7. Uses of English in Content-Area Courses

	Q2. Content-area instructors responded about their own courses. Students and English instructors responded about their perceptions whether content-area instructors use English.	Content-Area Instructors (N=55)			Students (N=60)			English Instructors (N=20)		
		#	%	Rank	#	%	Rank	#	%	Rank
2-0	Do you (think that professors at Kyushu University) use English in their/your content-area courses? (1 Yes)	37	67.3		48	100		14	100	
2-1	They conduct lecture-format classes mostly in English.	6	10.9	8	17	35.4	6	7	50.0	4
2-2	They conduct seminar-format classes mostly in English.	3	5.5	9	12	25.0	9	6	42.9	7
2-3	They use English for certain students such as foreign students in giving supplementary explanations.	12	21.8	5	13	27.1	7	7	50.0	4
2-4	They sometimes use English for the whole class if they have foreign students in class.	10	18.2	6	13	27.1	7	7	50.0	4
2-5	They use English documents (including electronic media) in class without translating them into Japanese.	26	47.3	1	36	75.0	1	14	100	1
2-6	They (ask students to) translate English documents (including electronic media) into Japanese in class.	16	29.1	2	29	60.4	2	13	92.9	2
2-7	They ask students to read English documents (including electronic media) outside class for preparation or review.	16	29.1	2	26	54.2	4	10	71.4	3
2-8	They ask students to give oral presentations in English.	7	12.7	7	22	45.8	5	6	42.9	7
2-9	They ask students to write reports and papers in English.	14	25.5	4	29	60.4	2	6	42.9	7
2-90	Other ( )	3	5.5		1	2.1		1	7.1	

The questionnaire finds that some instructors conduct classes mostly in English, suggesting that English is used as a medium of instruction (i.e., ESL use in the narrow sense as opposed to EFL use). Although the actual use is less than what students and English instructors predict, it is still noteworthy that some content courses are taught in English in Kyushu University, a conservative "pure" Japanese university, unlike a Japanese campus of an American university. These English-medium courses of course include those in special programs such as JTW (Japan in Today's World, offered in the International Student Center with courses mainly teaching about Japan in English). Yet, we must note that even Japanese instructors teach content courses in English especially in science and technology, as we found in joint faculty development meetings with faculties in such areas.

Question 3. Perceptions about Students' Uses of English in Future

This question asked what domains students would likely use English after graduating from Bachelor's and Master's programs. Table 8 shows its results.

Table 8. Perceptions about Students' Uses of English in Future

	Q3. Do you think that Kyushu University students will use English after they complete their studies?	Content-Area Instructors (N=55)			Students (N=60)			English Instructors (N=20)		
		#	%	Rank	#	%	Rank	#	%	Rank
3-0	(1 Yes)	52	94.5		49	81.7		16	80.0	
3-1	They will read printed and Web pages with technical contents.	42	76.4	1	28	46.7	3	14	70.0	4
3-2	They will read printed and Web pages with non-technical contents.	21	38.2	13	22	36.7	4	15	75.0	2
3-3	They will read email with technical contents.	36	65.5	3	15	25.0	9	12	60.0	10
3-4	They will read email with non-technical contents.	22	40.0	11	13	21.7	10	13	65.0	6
3-5	They will write research papers with technical contents.	30	54.5	6	16	26.7	8	11	55.0	11
3-6	They will write memos and reports with technical contents.	28	50.9	7	18	30.0	7	11	55.0	11
3-7	They will write memos and reports with non-technical contents.	8	14.5	20	5	8.3	19	11	55.0	11
3-8	They will write email with technical contents.	31	56.4	4	9	15.0	15	13	65.0	6
3-9	They will write email with non-technical contents.	18	32.7	15	7	11.7	17	14	70.0	4
3-10	They will listen to presentations and lectures with technical contents.	39	70.9	2	20	33.3	5	10	50.0	14
3-11	They will listen to presentations and lectures with non-technical contents.	12	21.8	17	8	13.3	16	7	35.0	18
3-12	They will give presentations and lectures with technical contents.	26	47.3	9	12	20.0	11	8	40.0	16
3-13	They will give presentations and lectures with non-technical contents.	10	18.2	19	4	6.7	20	8	40.0	16
3-14	They will engage in conversations with technical contents.	31	56.4	4	10	16.7	14	10	50.0	14
3-15	They will engage in conversations with non-technical contents.	24	43.6	10	19	31.7	6	13	65.0	6
3-16	They will participate in discussion and debate with technical contents.	27	49.1	8	12	20.0	11	7	35.0	18
3-17	They will participate in discussion and debate with non-technical contents.	11	20.0	18	6	10.0	18	6	30.0	20
3-18	They will take English examinations when they apply for a job.	14	25.5	16	30	50.0	2	13	65.0	6
3-19	They will take English examinations when they apply for graduate school.	22	40.0	11	31	51.7	1	15	75.0	2
3-20	They will study at a university in a country where English is the first or official language.	20	36.4	14	12	20.0	11	16	80.0	1

3-21	They will study at a university in a country where English is not the first or official language.	4	7.3	21	3	5.0	21	6	30.0	20
3-90	Other ( )	1	1.8		2	3.3		1	5.0	

When we look at the top-10 of each group (color-marked cells in rank), content-area instructors' responses are around the domains of reception and production of technical contents. Students generally selected fewer items than other groups (average 8.7 items selected by content-area instructors, 5 by students, and 11.7 by English instructors), suggesting that freshmen could not have specific judgments about their future use of English. They ranked reading and listening about technical contents relatively high but their perceptions of email and conversation are ranked low. If the content-area instructors' perception were to reflect the actual use, daily communication such as email and conversation about technical contents would be much more common than the students' perception. English instructors' perceptions resulted in relatively low ranks of technical domains. When we look at percentages, those of technical domains were rated generally high but non-technical domains were even more highly rated. Priorities of English use in different domains are differently perceived by content-area instructors and English instructors. In order to develop most serviceable curriculum for our students, we must collect more data such as actual discourse data and perceptions of graduates in different career paths.

When we look at the results from the students' ranking, examinations for graduate schools and jobs were ranked high, while such domains were ranked low by content-area instructors. Yet, we must note here that examinations, which work as extrinsic motivation, were ranked high among the perceived needs. (Cf. *Gaikokugo no Susume (Invitation to Foreign Languages)* published by the FLC for incoming freshmen also lists foreign language requirements in graduate school admission tests, suggesting that students will need foreign languages if they want to pursue graduate study.) English instructors also ranked those examinations relatively high. Reception of non-technical contents is also ranked high both by students and by English instructors. These show that content-area instructors are more ESP-oriented while students and English instructors perceive the need of English in more general communication as well. If we were to

make our English program in general education tailored for ESP because of the pressure from content-area faculties especially in science and technology fields, we would end up with an unbalanced curriculum. (Kaburagi (2003, p. 51) in *Daigaku Kyooiku* places foreign language education in Kyushu University's general education on the "cultural/liberal" side in the "cultural/liberal" vs. "practical/pragmatic" dichotomy.)

One problem to note here is that the wording of some questions had a problem; as pointed out by Professor Anscomb-Iino during the development of the English version of the questionnaire, it is not clear what are technical and what are non-technical contents. The main survey should take care of such working problems if it includes these items.

If we look at the same results from English instructors' perspective, they ranked two items noticeably higher than the other groups did, namely, studying at a university in an English-speaking country and reading/writing emails in non-technical contents. This may be a reflection of their own experiences in using English. Studying abroad may not be as popular among Kyushu University students as English instructors think (or not as popular as the media depict and people out in the society in general talk about). In this background is a historical pattern of Japanese elites' career path, which is strongly domestic in many fields. In other Asian countries, studying abroad is an elite path in one way or another. While in Japan, at least until now, studying abroad did not necessarily help one's promotion in companies and government agencies. Those who had studied abroad sometimes became the targets of xenophobia and isolated from their domestic colleagues. Sometimes they were labeled as "overseas specialists" or "language specialists" and left behind from the promotion ladder in the domestic main office. The current situations need to be researched. (Cf. Did Kyushu University's President, Professor Kajiyama still need Kyushu's engineering doctorate even after he received his UMass PhD?)

Question 4. Students' Proficiency of English

Question 4 asked about students' proficiency of English in the respondents' perception. The results are shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Perceptions about Students English Proficiency

	Q4. How would you assess the English proficiency of average Kyushu University students at the end of their 2nd year at university?	Content-area (N=55)		Students (N=60)		English (N=20)*	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
4-1	reading comprehension						
	1. The current proficiency is sufficient for use after graduation.	0	0	1	1.7	4	19.0
	2. They will achieve a sufficient proficiency before graduation if they continue their current efforts.	15	27.3	11	18.3	7	33.3
	3. They need to make more effort to study before graduation.	38	69.1	47	78.3	10	47.6
	4. Other	2	3.6	1	1.7	1	4.76
4-2	translating English documents into Japanese						
	1. The current proficiency is sufficient for use after graduation.	1	1.8	1	1.7	3	14.3
	2. They will achieve a sufficient proficiency before graduation if they continue their current efforts.	24	43.6	12	20.0	3	14.3
	3. They need to make more effort to study before graduation.	18	32.7	36	60.0	8	38.1
	4. Other	2	3.6	1	1.7	7	33.3
4-3	writing						
	1. The current proficiency is sufficient for use after graduation.	0	0	0	0	2	10.0
	2. They will achieve a sufficient proficiency before graduation if they continue their current efforts.	1	1.8	5	8.3	3	15.0
	3. They need to make more effort to study before graduation.	49	89.1	54	90.0	13	65.0
	4. Other	5	9.1	1	1.7	2	10.0
4-4	listening comprehension						
	1. The current proficiency is sufficient for use after graduation.	0	0	1	1.7	1	5.0
	2. They will achieve a sufficient proficiency before graduation if they continue their current efforts.	4	7.3	7	11.7	4	20.0
	3. They need to make more effort to study before graduation.	44	80.0	50	83.3	13	65.0
	4. Other	7	12.7	2	3.3	2	10.0
4-5	daily conversation						
	1. The current proficiency is sufficient for use after graduation.	0	0	0	0	2	10.0
	2. They will achieve a sufficient proficiency before graduation if they continue their current efforts.	8	14.5	3	5.0	2	10.0
	3. They need to make more effort to study before graduation.	41	74.5	55	91.7	14	70.0
	4. Other	6	10.9	2	3.3	2	10
4-6	debate, discussion, and oral presentation						
	1. The current proficiency is sufficient for use after graduation.	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2. They will achieve a sufficient proficiency before graduation if they continue their current efforts.	2	3.6	0	0	3	14.3
	3. They need to make more effort to study before graduation.	45	81.8	58	96.7	15	71.4
	4. Other	8	14.5	2	3.3	3	14.3

* Some respondents chose more than one alternative.

The overall recognition that the students' current proficiency and study efforts are not sufficient is commonly shared by the three groups. Among different skills, reading proficiency, especially translation into Japanese, was considered to reach a sufficient level by some respondents if the students continued the current efforts. Some respondents, notably content-area instructors, perceived reading and translating as separate. Similarly, writing might have been perceived differently from translating Japanese into English if the questions had been asked separately.

Wording of alternative choices in these questions was inappropriate. The term "current efforts" was meant to be students' own efforts but many respondents might be confused with the contents of the courses and teaching methods. Some respondents might assume that students' efforts were insufficient while course contents and teaching methods were adequate. Some, on the other hand, might assume that students' efforts meant the contents and methods of their study, which students were not necessarily responsible for.

Question 4-7 asked about proficiency targets in terms of external examinations especially TOEIC and TOEFL. The average scores are given in Table 10.

Table 10. Average Target Scores in External Tests

Test	TOEFL	TOEIC
Content-area instructors	552	667
Students	558	621
English instructors	546	850*

* Only one English instructor gave a TOEIC score.

The questionnaire offered some information about test scores such as American universities' admission criteria and average scores of Japanese, Korean, and Chinese test-takers. This certainly influenced respondents' judgment and thus the results were difficult to interpret. Furthermore, some respondents were confused with TOEIC and TOEFL scores, whose score ranges are different. Among English instructors, only one respondent gave TOEIC score thus making it a unique datum. The question was also unclear about the time frame of the achievement and thus its results are difficult to interpret. For example, if the target score was for a graduate student's studying abroad, what

was the target score at the time of sophomore?

An important consideration in asking Engineering instructors about external examinations is their relation with the JABEE, Japan's equivalent to American ABET (Accreditation Board of Engineering Technology). It is difficult to see how Engineering departments in Kyushu University are coping with their students' international communication ability for their programs' accreditation as I discussed elsewhere (email message dated October 7, 2003 sent to lang@flc.kyushu-u.ac.jp, Subject: TOEIC & JABEE (Japan Accreditation Board for Engineering Education)). I wonder if there is really a strong pressure on students about their TOEIC score, since some of the engineering programs in Japan set the target English proficiency fairly low. How much pressure do they really have in terms of TOEIC scores for job applications? We must seek for data from companies and our graduates working there.

Question 5. Priorities in the Contents of English Courses

This question asks about the perceived priorities in the contents of English courses in the section of Languages & Cultures I, part of the general education program. This question would be an important item in a straightforward needs analysis but we must note that the data are perceptions of different participants in foreign language education. The data do not necessarily coincide with more objective gaps between the current students' proficiency and the required proficiency functional in students' future situations. Nor do the data logically imply that such and such course contents will indeed help improve students' proficiency in needed domains.

However, we cannot ignore perceptions of the participants in education. Students' perceived needs are concerned with their motivation. If content-area instructors and students are not satisfied with the foreign language education, it will show up as low evaluation of the program. English instructors' perceptions cannot be ignored either. If their perceptions of their students' needs are different from the students' perceived or objective needs, some efforts are needed to change the instructors' perception, such as training for instructors. If the instructors' perceptions are intact and a curriculum or syllabus is imposed on them against their will, they will complain and their teaching will not be effective.

Those instructors may, intentionally or unintentionally, circumvent the implementation of the curriculum or syllabus. Even if a new curriculum or syllabus is introduced as part of the formal structure, actual practices of teaching in classes may not follow the changes.

In this preliminary survey, there was confusion about the listed items. Some items are concerned with genres of teaching materials (expository prose, research papers, news articles) while some other items are concerned with specific skills such as public speaking. We may want to more rigorously sort out the elements of the curriculum (cf. J. D. Brown (1995), *The Elements of Language Curriculum*). But such sorting may not be a stable classification and it may be difficult to come up with an adequate system of presenting choices in the questionnaire. More practically, we may not be able to use detailed/systematic classification, because the main survey will probably use less number of items in the questionnaire so that it can be less time-consuming for the respondents, including all the full-time faculty members in the university. (A question also remains undecided about whether the main survey will use forced-choice questions or open-ended questions.)

With the above limitations in mind, Table 11 summarizes the number of respondents who chose each item, percentages against the total number of respondents, and ranks within each group of respondents. Top-10 rank numbers are in bold and top 5s are further marked red.

Table 11. Contents Needed for English Courses (Languages & Cultures I Section)

Q5. What contents should be given higher priorities?	Content-area instructors (N=55)			Students (N=60)			English Instructors (N=20)		
	#	%	rank	#	%	rank	#	%	rank
5-1 Teaching vocabulary.	7	12.7	21	13	21.7	15	9	45.0	10
5-2 Teaching grammar.	15	27.3	12	15	25	14	6	30.0	19
5-3 Teaching how to use dictionaries.	3	5.5	25	5	8.3	29	6	30.0	19
5-4 Teaching pronunciation.	7	12.7	21	29	48.3	4	10	50.0	5
5-5 Teaching translation from English into Japanese.	17	30.9	11	27	45.0	6	3	15.0	25
5-6 Using materials directly relevant to the students' specialized fields.	9	16.4	18	12	20.0	17	10	50.0	5
5-7 Teaching the cultures of "native-speaker" countries such as the US, Britain, and Australia.	14	25.5	14	16	26.7	13	10	50.0	5
5-8 Teaching the cultures of other countries and regions through English texts.	3	5.5	25	8	13.3	24	8	40.0	12
5-9 Using articles written in English about Japan.	8	14.5	19	6	10.0	28	6	30.0	19
5-10 Allowing students to choose the contents of the class as much as possible.	2	3.6	28	25	41.7	7	8	40.0	12
5-11 Teaching reading comprehension skills of literary works.	2	3.6	28	9	15.0	21	4	20.0	23
5-12 Educating students for spiritual enrichment through literary works and essays.	0	0	30	5	8.3	29	3	15.0	25
5-13 Teaching reading comprehension skills of news stories and expository prose.	26	47.3	6	31	51.7	3	13	65.0	1
5-14 Teaching reading comprehension skills of research articles and reports.	36	65.5	1	21	35.0	10	7	35.0	17
5-15 Teaching reading comprehension skills of letters and memos.	18	32.7	10	11	18.3	18	8	40.0	12
5-16 Teaching translation from Japanese to English.	19	34.5	9	18	30.0	12	3	15.0	25
5-17 Teaching to write news stories and expository prose.	13	23.6	15	9	15.0	21	4	20.0	23
5-18 Teaching creative writing.	10	18.2	17	8	13.3	24	7	35.0	17
5-19 Teaching to write research articles and reports.	34	61.8	2	22	36.7	9	12	60.0	2
5-20 Teaching to write letters and memos.	25	45.5	8	13	21.7	15	8	40.0	12
5-21 Teaching to read and write email messages.	13	23.6	15	10	16.7	19	8	40.0	12
5-22 Teaching to create Web pages in English.	3	5.5	25	8	13.3	24	3	15.0	25
5-23 Teaching typing.	5	9.1	24	10	16.7	19	3	15.0	25
5-24 Teaching to create documents in English using computer programs such as Microsoft Word.	8	14.5	19	7	11.7	27	6	30.0	19
5-25 Teaching to make presentations using computer programs such as PowerPoint.	7	12.7	21	9	15.0	21	2	10.0	30
5-26 Teaching listening to lectures and speeches (comprehension and note taking).	34	61.8	2	32	53.3	2	10	50.0	5
5-27 Teaching listening to news reports.	15	27.3	12	23	38.3	8	9	45.0	10
5-28 Teaching to make speeches and oral presentations.	29	52.7	4	29	48.3	4	11	55.0	3
5-29 Teaching discussion and debate.	27	49.1	5	20	33.3	11	10	50.0	5
5-30 Teaching daily conversation.	26	47.3	6	41	68.3	1	11	55.0	3
5-90 Other (Please specify) ( )	5	9.1		1	1.7		2	10.0	

Content items commonly ranked high by the three groups (the item numbers are in bold and rows are lightly colored) are the four skills in formal domains together with daily conversation, which are plausible items. In relation to the newly proposed curriculum, a question remains whether we can ignore daily conversation, which is commonly desired for, especially by students. (The proposed curriculum, still pending, focuses academic skills because we assumed that our students have already studied daily communication skills in high school and because the hours allocated for the required English courses are limited.)

In reading domains, content-area instructors ranked research articles and reports high (top-ranked), while English instructors ranked them low. This leads to a question of ESP vs. EGP in the general education. How should we deal with different genres in our reading courses? Does the student's reading skill in one genre transfer to that in another genre? How should we coordinate the English program in general education (freshmen and sophomores) and that in upper years, which is definitely ESP?

When we look at top-10 items given by the content-area instructors, items related to academic skills are ranked high. However, content-area instructors do have a reasonable perception in that they are not asking us to teach ESP really specific to the students' future fields of specialization. Item 5-6 (the use of ESP materials) was selected only by 16.4% of the content-area instructors, thus ranked 18th.

As noted above, content-area instructors give their priority to academic genres such as research articles. It should also be noted that teaching translation from English to Japanese (Item 5-5) was selected by only about 30% of the instructors, being ranked 11th.

However, translation from Japanese to English (Item 5-16) was ranked relatively high, while students ranked it 12th and English instructors ranked it 25th. This may be a reflection of actual practice of content-area instructors; they may be writing papers in Japanese first and translating it into English. Or, it may be their belief in teaching English that students need *Eisakubun* "English Composition", i.e., translating Japanese sentences into English sentences in traditional classrooms.

When we turn to students' choices, daily conversation is ranked No. 1.

Students, as well as English instructors, ranked teaching pronunciation relatively high, while content-area instructors ranked it low. In line with their opinions expressed in joint FD (Faculty Development) meetings with science/technology faculties, we need a viewpoint of World Englishes or of local/ethnic varieties of English. I would suggest that we must make efforts to establish Japanese English as one of such legitimate varieties. Of course, such a Japanese variety of English must be intelligible internationally *albeit* accented. (Cf. If I remember correctly, Professor Komatsu expressed his concern in an English Department meeting that Kyushu University students' pronunciation was unintelligible internationally given his work experiences with a variety of Englishes; he had been working in international agencies before coming to the FLC.)

Students often selected translation from/into English, which may be interpreted as the result of their past method of learning English, simply as inertia (imprinted). Or their selection was based on their positive evaluation of the traditional method of teaching in Japanese schools because they considered themselves successful in learning English since they had passed the entrance examinations of Kyushu University.

Students selected writing papers and reports less frequently than the other groups. This could be resulted from their lack of perceptions about future needs or it could be resulted from their negative attitude that writing papers in class would be boring or a heavy burden for them. Such a negative attitude, if there is, should be considered in teaching writing courses.

The priority profile given by the English instructors was probably influenced by the skewed profile of the respondents. Since the number of Japanese instructors was small, we must further find out their perceptions of the students' needs and their preferences of course contents to teach so that we can identify possible obstacles against effective implementation of a curriculum reform.

Question 6. Structures and Teaching Methods of English Courses

Question 6 asks about how English courses should be offered including both structural factors such as scheduling and class sizes and teaching methods. Table 12 shows the number of respondents that chose each item, percentages, and the rank of each item in each respondent group. Top-10 items in each group

are marked with bold rank numbers and top 5s are further marked red. Items commonly ranked high by the three groups are marked with bold item numbers and their rows are lightly colored.

Table 12. Suggestions for Structures and Teaching Methods

	Q6. In terms of the format and teaching methodology of the English courses (subjects) in "Language & Culture Courses I" (offered in Ropponmatsu for freshmen and sophomores as a foreign language requirement), what should be given higher priorities?	Content-area instructors (N=55)			Students (N=60)			English Instructors (N=20)		
		#	%	rank	#	%	rank	#	%	rank
6-1	Using only English in class.	24	43.6	3	24	40	4	8	40	6
6-2	Giving explanations in class in Japanese to make them easy to understand.	5	9.1	17	17	28.3	8	5	25	11
6-3	Using the lecture format.	1	1.8	19	8	13.3	16	2	10	18
6-4	Asking individual students to respond in class.	10	18.2	12	3	5	19	3	15	16
6-5	Giving exercises in small groups and pairs.	16	29.1	7	23	38.3	5	8	40	6
6-6	Utilizing technology in language labs and CALL classrooms.	15	27.3	9	14	23.3	10	7	35	10
6-7	Teaching in small classes (below 20 students) .	31	56.4	2	32	53.3	1	14	70	1
6-8	Shortening one class period (currently 90 minutes to e.g., 60 minutes).	4	7.3	18	14	23.3	10	4	20	15
6-9	Increasing the number of classes per week.	10	18.2	12	20	33.3	6	10	50	3
6-10	Concentrating the classes into a shorter period rather than stretching them over two years. (E.g., offering required English classes every day during the first two semesters.)	18	32.7	6	10	16.7	13	8	40	6
6-11	Giving routine drills by using TAs.	11	20	11	10	16.7	13	5	25	11
6-12	Giving frequent quizzes.	8	14.5	15	5	8.3	18	5	25	11
6-13	Increasing study hours outside the regular classes such as self-learning and homework.	10	18.2	12	9	15	15	8	40	6
6-14	Placing students in different levels of classes with a placement test.	20	36.4	4	13	21.7	12	11	55	2
6-15	Denying credits to students who regularly participate in class but do not achieve the course objectives.	19	34.5	5	6	10	17	5	25	11
6-16	Giving credits based on study trips to an English-speaking country.	16	29.1	7	28	46.7	3	9	45	4
6-17	Giving credits based on students' learning outside the university such as in a language school.	8	14.5	15	15	25	9	3	15	16
6-18	Making English the required first foreign language (Currently most students can choose their first foreign language out of several languages).	14	25.5	10	18	30	7	2	10	18
6-19	Making a non-English language the required first foreign language.	0	0	20	3	5	19	1	5	20
6-20	Giving credits based on popular proficiency tests such as TOEFL/TOEIC.	36	65.5	1	31	51.7	2	9	45	4
6-90	Other (Please specify) ( )	6	10.9		0	0		3	15	

Both Questions 5 and 6 asked about the respondents' judgment and perception but many of them, especially students, were likely to choose items based on their subjective preference— "I want to take such a course" or "I don't want to take such a course." The way the questions were asked could not distinguish the respondents with subjective preferences in mind from the respondents who were thinking: "I personally don't like this kind of course but it will probably help students improve their English." We may want to take care of this problem in the main survey.

Especially in Question 6, since content-area instructors and students are not specialists in foreign language education, their judgments are not necessarily rational but are often based on personal preferences, conventions/traditions, false beliefs, information from popular media, etc. Of course, English instructors' responses are not necessarily based on empirical and theoretical grounds but often based on simple rules of thumb and personal preferences. However, as I discussed above, it is important for us to find all those people's perceptions and attitudes since they would influence the implementation of a curriculum, positively or negatively.

There were a number of items highly ranked by all three groups: small classes, giving credits based on external exams, use of English in class, giving credits to study trips, practices in pairs and small groups. The use of language labs and CALL attracted some support as well. In what follows, we will look at the results group-wise.

We will first look at items preferred by content-area instructors. Giving credits based on external exams has two aspects: (1) making educational goals and assessments more objective; and (2) exempting some students from attending physical classes. (1) is a reasonable suggestion together with the selection of Item 6-15 (Denying credits to students who regularly participate in class but do not achieve the course objectives. 34.5% ranking 5th) in line with "quality control and accountability," the recent trend of university education in general. Item 6-15 was not supported by students probably because of their easy-going attitude that they want easy credits helped by "class attendance points" as long as they attend the class. However, we must note that instructors must make efforts to design lessons in which students are able to attain the objectives if they

regularly "participate" in class and make reasonable efforts. (This note is in the context of many traditional university courses in which the final examination accounts for the large part of the grade and/or the instructor uses class-curve evaluation rather than absolute criteria-based evaluation).

In order to increase the "density" of class (the amount of learning within a certain period of time), small class and group work are ranked high but the increase of weekly class hours is not supported nor a shorter class (currently 90 minutes). The result is difficult to interpret since these natures of course are related to the number of meetings per week, the number of credits for one course, and whether the course is classified as "lecture," "seminar," or "practicum/laboratory work"; they use different credit-hour bases. Also supported by content-area instructors is concentrated offering of classes (Item 6-10). Streaming classes based on a placement test is supported by both content-area and English instructors but not particularly supported by students.

Some members in the needs analysis project group anticipated that science/technology faculty members would support the idea of making English the required 1st foreign language but the result was different. Students' support is higher than the faculty support. One note here is that the responses were not tabulated in each department thus making it impossible to compare results among different departments.

Students' responses differed in giving credits to classes they take in outside language schools. A need for explanation in Japanese may be a reaction particular to the students in Inoue's class. It may be a reaction to anxiety and lack of understanding they felt from classes conducted in English. The student survey was conducted in Inoue's class in which English was often used in explanation but separate data from students' evaluation showed that some students were negative about my use of English in explanation.

English instructors' response pattern is not greatly different from that of the other groups. Streaming classes and increasing the number of weekly classes are reasonable responses, although the number of weekly classes is related to many other factors which were not considered in this survey. Concentrated offering of classes is supported by both groups of instructors but not particularly by students. Students may worry about schedule conflicts with other courses or may

worry about such courses in long breaks like summer. English instructors might also oppose if they were to be asked to teach during the summer vacation.

Giving credits to study trips may be incorporated into the language program as an elective subject but such credits cannot be substitutes to required credits unless the compatibility of class contents and evaluation standards are carefully examined. The current FLC practices of giving credits to such trips (studying a few weeks in Pembroke College, Cambridge in summer) consider a very broad compatibility. This is in a sense inevitable since the current curriculum does not specify course contents in any systematic way.

Item 6-13 (Increasing study hours outside the regular classes such as self-learning and homework) was ranked high only by English instructors but the wording had a problem. It means (1) "Students should spend more time on studying English" and (2) "Students should be given formal credits based on their self-study using CALL or other means." This is related to the calculation of credit hours and how many such hours should be spent in teacher-instructed classes.

Question 7. English Courses in "Language & Culture II" Section (Elective Courses)

Elective courses offered in the Hakozaki Branch Office of the FLC received generally high esteems from content-area faculties. Those courses are offered in the Hakozaki campus where most of the departments are located. Students sign up for courses based on their scores of the required placement test. The credits are counted toward their BA requirements as part of free elective credits but do not satisfy their foreign language requirements. Students range from sophomores to graduate students and some courses even include university staff.

Since those courses are not targeted for freshmen and offered in a separate campus, it is understandable that many of the surveyed freshmen did not know them. Some English instructors did not know them because part-time instructors teaching only in the Ropponmatsu campus are not responsible for those courses at all. Table 13 shows the results.

Table 13. Language & Culture II Courses

Q7. The Faculty of Languages and Cultures offers the following English courses (subjects) in the "Language and Culture II" Program at its Hakozaki Branch Office: Conversation I & II, Listening I & II, Reading on Current Topics, Reading in the Natural Sciences, Reading in the Humanities, Reading Literature, Practical English I & II (Test-taking skills for TOEFL/TOEIC), Essay Writing I & II			
	Content-area instructors	Students	English instructors
(1) Did you know that such courses (subjects) are offered?	Yes 35 No 17	Yes 7 No 51	Yes 12 No 6
(2) How would you consider the need for such courses (subjects)? Average Rate	4.08	3.70	4.45
1. Not necessary at all.	1	0	0
2. Not very necessary.	0	1	0
3. Cannot decide.	9	23	2
4. Very necessary.	25	25	7
5. Extremely necessary. These kinds of courses should be increased.	16	8	11
No answer	4	3	0

Question 8. Open-Ended Question

Question 8 asked respondents to write their opinions freely about the contents of the survey, including goals that Kyushu University students should make efforts to achieve. The responses to this question are yet to be analyzed.

4. Some Notes for Writing Questions for the Main Survey: Needs Analysis for Curriculum Development

For the purpose of curriculum development (rather than critical analysis of competing needs of participants), I would like to suggest that we identify tasks that students need to be able to perform by the end of 2nd year and tasks that most students are able to perform at the time of entering the university, following task-based curriculum (Cf. Long & Crookes (1992) in *TESOL Quarterly*).

In order to identify such tasks, I suggest that we analyze more objective than subjective needs of content-area instructors and students ("I want students to be able to do this" or "I can do such and such"). Namely, we should identify necessary tasks through the analysis of teaching materials and assignments in content courses as well as discourse analysis of classes and academic activities

of students and professors. We would then extract tasks more or less common across disciplines from the identified tasks, i.e. finding general EAP (English for Academic Purposes) contents from more specialized ESP contents. The students' ability (inability) to perform such tasks should be measured by tests including such a test to ask students to perform these tasks.

This kind of needs analysis cannot be conducted by paper-based questionnaires with closed questions. We should first conduct interviews and open-ended questionnaires, through which we can find content-area instructors who are willing to cooperate with our project. Students' ability should be assessed at the time of entering the university and at the end of their 2nd year. Students' and instructors' objective opinions should also be further surveyed about their likes/dislikes of course formats and teaching methods.

References

Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach to program development.* Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Gaikokugo no Susume [Invitation to Foreign Languages]. 2008-2012 versions are available online. Retrieved March 14, 2022 from http://www.flc.kyushu-u.ac.jp/~koho/susume.html

Kaburagi, M. (2003). Kyooyoo no <koa> o donoyooni koosei suru ka: "Koa kyoyoo kamoku" saikoo [How should we configure liberal arts "core"?: Rethinking "core liberal arts courses". *Daigaku-kyooiku [Kyushu Journal of Higher Education]*, 7, 45-59. https://doi.org/10.15017/21951

Long, M. H., & Crookes, G. (1992). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL quarterly, 26*(1), 27-56. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587368

Appendix (Survey Form, English version)

Survey of Needs for Foreign Language Education in Kyushu University

<div align="right">January 2003</div>

Dear Colleagues,

The Faculty of Languages & Cultures is conducting a needs analysis to collect data in order to improve the foreign language curriculum of Kyushu University. As part of this project, we would like to ask you to complete this survey since you are teaching English in this university. We are afraid that the number of questions is large but ask for your cooperation to help us improve our educational program.

Some of the questions may sound strange to English teachers since we have used the basically the same questionnaire for faculty members in other specialized areas for the sake of comparison. Please answer all questions as they are.

Please place the completed survey in the box in the common room (or the department office) or send it to Prof. Inoue before February 18th.

<div align="right">Studies in Language Education, Faculty of Languages & Cultures,
Kyushu University
(Attn: Narahiko INOUE)</div>

....

Please describe yourself:

Last Name (   ) First Name (   )

Affiliation: (   )

Academic Field/Specialization: (   )

Gender: male / female (Circle one.)

Age: 20s / 30s / 40s / 50s / 60s (Circle one.)

....

Title in your home institution: *joshu* (assistant) / *kooshi* (lecturer) / *jokyooju* (associate professor) / *kyooju* (professor) / other (   ) (Circle one.)

1. Do you use English in your own research? (1 Yes 2 No)

   If your answer is 1 (Yes), in what situations do you often use English? Please list all applicable items in the order of importance from the list below. If you choose to list the items in a random order, please indicate that. If you want to add other items to the list, please use numbers 90 & 91 and also describe the situations.

   Rank order: _____

   1. I read printed and Web pages with technical contents.
   2. I read printed and Web pages with non-technical contents.
   3. I read email with technical contents.
   4. I read email with non-technical contents.
   5. I write research papers with technical contents.
   6. I write memos and reports with technical contents.
   7. I write memos and reports with non-technical contents.
   8. I write email with technical contents.
   9. I write email with non-technical contents.
   10. I listen to presentations and lectures with technical contents.
   11. I listen to presentations and lectures with non-technical contents.
   12. I give presentations and lectures with technical contents.
   13. I give presentations and lectures with non-technical contents.
   14. I engage in conversations with technical contents.
   15. I engage in conversations with non-technical contents.
   16. I participate in discussion and debate with technical contents.
   17. I participate in discussion and debate with non-technical contents.
   90. Other (   )
   91. Other (   )

2. Do you think that professors at Kyushu University use English in their content-area courses? (1 Yes 2 No)

   If your answer is 1 (Yes), in what situations do you think they often use English? Please list all applicable items in the order of importance from the list below. If you choose to list the items in a random order, please indicate that. If

you want to add other items to the list, please use numbers 90 & 91 and also describe the situations.

    Rank order: _____

1.   They conduct lecture-format classes mostly in English.
2.   They conduct seminar-format classes mostly in English.
3.   They use English for certain students such as foreign students in giving supplementary explanations.
4.   They sometimes use English for the whole class if they have foreign students in class.
5.   They use English documents (including electronic media) in class without translating them into Japanese.
6.   They (ask students to) translate English documents (including electronic media) into Japanese in class.
7.   They ask students to read English documents (including electronic media) outside class for preparation or review.
8.   They ask students to give oral presentations in English.
9.   They ask students to write reports and papers in English.
90. Other (   )
91. Other (   )

3. Do you think that Kyushu University students will use English after they complete their studies? (1 Yes   2 No)

If your answer is 1 (Yes), in what situations do you think they often use English? Please list all applicable items in the order of importance from the list below. If you choose to list the items in a random order, please indicate that. If you want to add other items to the list, please use numbers 90 & 91 and also describe the situations

    Rank order: _____

1.   They will read printed and Web pages with technical contents.
2.   They will read printed and Web pages with non-technical contents.
3.   They will read email with technical contents.
4.   They will read email with non-technical contents.
5.   They will write research papers with technical contents.

6.   They will write memos and reports with technical contents.

7.   They will write memos and reports with non-technical contents.

8.   They will write email with technical contents.

9.   They will write email with non-technical contents.

10. They will listen to presentations and lectures with technical contents.

11. They will listen to presentations and lectures with non-technical contents.

12. They will give presentations and lectures with technical contents.

13. They will give presentations and lectures with non-technical contents.

14. They will engage in conversations with technical contents.

15. They will engage in conversations with non-technical contents.

16. They will participate in discussion and debate with technical contents.

17. They will participate in discussion and debate with non-technical contents.

18. They will take English examinations when they apply for a job.

19. They will take English examinations when they apply for graduate school.

20. They will study at a university in a country where English is the first or official language.

21. They will study at a university in a country where English is not the first or official language.

90. Other (   )

91. Other (   )

4. The following questions are concerned with the English proficiency of average Kyushu University students at the end of their 2nd year at university.

   (1) How would you assess their reading comprehension in English?

      1. The current proficiency is sufficient for use after graduation.

      2. They will achieve a sufficient proficiency before graduation if they continue their current efforts.

      3. They need to make more effort to study before graduation.

      4. Other (Please specify.) (   )

(2) How would you assess their proficiency in translating English docu-
   ments into Japanese?
   1. The current proficiency is sufficient for use after graduation.
   2. They will achieve a sufficient proficiency before graduation if they
      continue their current efforts.
   3. They need more effort than now before graduation.
   4. Other (Please specify.) (   )
(3) How would you assess their English proficiency in writing?
   1. The current proficiency is sufficient for use after graduation.
   2. They will achieve a sufficient proficiency before graduation if they
      continue their current efforts.
   3. They need to make more effort to study before graduation.
   4. Other (Please specify.) (   )
(4) How would you assess their listening comprehension in English?
   1. The current proficiency is sufficient for use after graduation.
   2. They will achieve a sufficient proficiency before graduation if they
      continue their current efforts.
   3. They need to make more effort to study before graduation.
   4. Other (Please specify.) (   )
(5) How would you assess their English proficiency in daily conversation?
   1. The current proficiency is sufficient for use after graduation.
   2. They will achieve a sufficient proficiency before graduation if they
      continue their current efforts.
   3. They need to make more effort to study before graduation.
   4. Other (Please specify.) (   )
(6) How would you assess their English proficiency in debate, discussion,
   and oral presentation?
   1. The current proficiency is sufficient for use after graduation.
   2. They will achieve a sufficient proficiency before graduation if they
      continue their current efforts.
   3. They need to make more effort to study before graduation.
   4. Other (Please specify.) (   )

(7) In proficiency tests in English, what should the target score for Kyushu University students be? On the paper-based TOEFL, the average score of Japanese is 505; Korean, 530; Chinese, 560 (TOEFL Test and Score Data Summary, 2001-2002 edition). Universities in the United States generally require 500-550 for admission to undergraduate programs and 550-600 for graduate programs. Exchange students from Kyushu University are required to score 550. Japanese companies often use TOEIC scores to evaluate their employees' proficiency in English.

Name of the Test (   ) Target Score (   )

5. In terms of the <u>contents</u> of the English courses (subjects) in "Language & Culture Courses I" (offered in Ropponmatsu for freshmen and sophomores as a foreign language requirement), what should be given higher priorities? Please list all applicable items in the order of importance from the list below. If you choose to list the items in a random order, please indicate that. If you want to add other items to the list, please use numbers 90 & 91 and also describe the situations.

Rank order: _____

1.   Teaching vocabulary.
2.   Teaching grammar.
3.   Teaching how to use dictionaries.
4.   Teaching pronunciation.
5.   Teaching translation from English into Japanese.
6.   Using materials directly relevant to the students' specialized fields.
7.   Teaching the cultures of "native-speaker" countries such as the US, Britain, and Australia.
8.   Teaching the cultures of other countries and regions through English texts.
9.   Using articles written in English about Japan.
10.   Allowing students to choose the contents of the class as much as possible.
11.   Teaching reading comprehension skills of literary works.
12.   Educating students for spiritual enrichment through literary works and

essays.

13. Teaching reading comprehension skills of news stories and expository prose.
14. Teaching reading comprehension skills of research articles and reports.
15. Teaching reading comprehension skills of letters and memos.
16. Teaching translation from Japanese to English.
17. Teaching to write news stories and expository prose.
18. Teaching creative writing.
19. Teaching to write research articles and reports.
20. Teaching to write letters and memos.
21. Teaching to read and write email messages.
22. Teaching to create Web pages in English.
23. Teaching typing.
24. Teaching to create documents in English using computer programs such as Microsoft Word.
25. Teaching to make presentations using computer programs such as PowerPoint.
26. Teaching listening to lectures and speeches (comprehension and note taking).
27. Teaching listening to news reports.
28. Teaching to make speeches and oral presentations.
29. Teaching discussion and debate.
30. Teaching daily conversation.
90. Other (Please specify) (   )
91. Other (Please specify) (   )

6. In terms of the format and teaching methodology of the English courses (subjects) in "Language & Culture Courses I" (offered in Ropponmatsu for freshmen and sophomores as a foreign language requirement), what should be given higher priorities? Please list all applicable items in the order of importance from the list below. If you choose to list the items in a random order, please indicate that. If you want to add other items to the list, please use numbers 90 & 91 and also describe the situations.

Rank order: _____

1. Using only English in class.
2. Giving explanations in class in Japanese to make them easy to understand.
3. Using the lecture format.
4. Asking individual students to respond in class.
5. Giving exercises in small groups and pairs.
6. Utilizing technology in language labs and CALL classrooms.
7. Teaching in small classes (below 20 students).
8. Shortening one class period (currently 90 minutes to e.g., 60 minutes).
9. Increasing the number of classes per week.
10. Concentrating the classes into a shorter period rather than stretching them over two years. (E.g., offering required English classes every day during the first two semesters.)
11. Giving routine drills by using TAs.
12. Giving frequent quizzes.
13. Increasing study hours outside the regular classes such as self-learning and homework.
14. Placing students in different levels of classes with a placement test.
15. Denying credits to students who regularly participate in class but do not achieve the course objectives.
16. Giving credits based on study trips to an English-speaking country.
17. Giving credits based on students' learning outside the university such as in a language school.
18. Making English the required first foreign language (Currently most students can choose their first foreign language out of several languages).
19. Making a non-English language the required first foreign language.
20. Giving credits based on popular proficiency tests such as TOEFL/ TOEIC.
90. Other (Please specify) (   )
91. Other (Please specify) (   )

7. The Faculty of Languages and Cultures offers the following English courses (subjects) in the "Language and Culture II" Program at its Hakozaki Branch Office:

Conversation I & II, Listening I & II, Reading on Current Topics, Reading in the Natural Sciences, Reading in the Humanities, Reading Literature, Practical English I & II (Test-taking skills for TOEFL/TOEIC), Essay Writing I & II

(Note: These elective courses in small classes are primarily for students who want to improve their skills beyond their foreign language credit requirements. They are also open to graduate students and faculty members if space is available. Students are placed in courses appropriate for their English levels.)

(1) Did you know that such courses (subjects) are offered? (1 Yes   2 No)

(2) How would you consider the need for such courses (subjects)?

1. Not necessary at all.
2. Not very necessary.
3. Cannot decide.
4. Very necessary.
5. Extremely necessary. These kinds of courses should be increased.

8. Please give any comments on the contents of this survey including the desired efforts on the part of Kyushu University students.

Thank you for your cooperation.